

claim 20. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 20 and dependent claims 21-23 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 24, 27 and 33 recite a feature similar to the previously-discussed feature of claim 20. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claims 24, 27 and 33 are patentable over Noot, Mayle and Saito for at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 20. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 24, independent claim 27 and dependent claims 28 and 30-32, and independent claim 33 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12 and 13

On page 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noot, Mayle and Saito and further in view of “Web-enabled Speech Driven Facial Animation” by Ouhyoung et al. (“Ouhyoung”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 12 recite a feature similar to the previously discussed feature of claim 20. For at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 20, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 12 are patentable over Noot, Mayle and Saito. Applicants submit that Ouhyoung fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle and Saito. Therefore, Applicants submit that Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung do not disclose or suggest, either separately or in any combination, each and every feature of claims 1 and 12.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 12 be withdrawn. Claims 2, 4-6 and 13 depend either from claim 1 or claim 12 directly or as a base claim and are patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for the reasons discussed with respect to claims 1 and 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 4-6 and 13 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 3

On page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noot, in view of Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,217 to Grayson et al. (“Grayson”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, from which claim 3 depends, is patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that Grayson fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claim 3 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 7, 8 and 14

On page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,011 to Francini et al. (“Francini”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, from which claims 7 and 8 depend either directly or as a base claim, is patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants submit that Francini fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claims 7 and 8 be withdrawn.

Claim 12, from which claim 14 depends, is patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12. Applicants submit that Francini fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claim 14 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 9

On page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,147,692 to Shaw et al. (“Shaw”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, from which claim 9 depends, is patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicants submit that Shaw fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claim 9 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 10

On page 16 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,276,570 to Burson et al. (“Burson”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, from which claim 10 depends, is patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants submit that Burson fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claim 10 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 11 and 15

On page 17 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,638,502 to Murata. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, from which claim 11 depends, is patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants submit that Murata fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claim 11 be withdrawn.

Claim 12, from which claim 15 depends, is patentable over Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 12. Applicants submit that Murata fails to satisfy the deficiencies of Noot, Mayle, Saito and Ouhyoung. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claim 15 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 21, 2006

Correspondence Address:
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

By: 

Richard C. Irving
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 38,499
Phone: 410-286-9405
Fax No.: 410-510-1433